



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,055	09/24/2004	Hiroaki Sagawa	1422-0644PUS1	9947
2252	7590	02/23/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			JUEDES, AMY E	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1644	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/23/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/509,055	Applicant(s) SAGAWA ET AL.
	Examiner AMY E. JUEDES	Art Unit 1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12 and 14-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 14-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 12 and 28-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/22/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment and remarks, filed 11/21/08, are acknowledged.

Claims 1 and 28-30 have been amended.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12, and 14-35 are pending.

2. Claims 8 and 14-27 stand withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12, and 28-35 are being acted upon.

3. The information disclosure statement, filed on 1/22/09, is acknowledged. However, reference BN has been lined through since a copy of the reference could not be located in the file.

4. The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment to the claims. The cited references teach incubating CTL derived from the peripheral blood with fibronectin, and do not teach culturing a precursor cell capable of differentiating to a cytotoxic lymphocyte with fibronectin.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

Art Unit: 1644

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-7, 10, 12, and 28-35 stand provisionally rejected, on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8, 15-16, 30, 32, and 34 of copending Application No. 10/486,512, in view of Mizobata et al. and Chen et al., 1994.

As set forth previously, The '512 application claims a method for inducing cytotoxic T cells, a method for maintaining cytotoxic T cells, and a method for expanding cytotoxic T cells comprising incubating peripheral blood mononuclear cells with fibronectin and anti-CD3. The '512 application further claims that the fibronectin can be SEQ ID NO: 6, which is identical to SEQ ID NO:12 of the instant application. Additionally, it would have been obvious to further expand the cells with IL-2, since Mizobata et al. teaches that IL-2 induces proliferation of cytotoxic T cells (see Fig. 1 in particular). Furthermore, the limitations of the instant claims where the fibronectin is immobilized on a substrate, wherein the concentration of cells is between 1 cell/ml to 5×10^5 cells per ml, and wherein culturing is performed for 2-15 days represent obvious variations of the method claimed in the '512 application (see for example, Mizobata et al.) and do not render the instant claims patentably distinct. Moreover, it would have been obvious to transduce the cytotoxic T lymphocyte with a foreign gene, since Chen teaches that retroviral transduction with PKC allows long term growth of cytotoxic T cells in vitro.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant's request that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections be held in abeyance until the time of allowance is acknowledged.

7. Claims 1-7, 10, 12, and 28-35 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 and 20-21 of copending Application No. 10/568,745, in view of Mizobata et al.

As set forth previously, The '745 application claims a method for preparing a cytotoxic lymphocyte comprising the step of carrying out at least one step selected from induction, maintenance, and expansion of a cytotoxic lymphocyte in the presence of fibronectin or a fragment thereof. The '745 application further claims that the fibronectin fragment comprises SEQ ID NO: 13, which is the same as SEQ ID NO: 12 of the instant application. The '745 application also claims that the fibronectin is immobilized on a substrate and that the concentration of cells is between 1 cell/ml to 5×10^5 cells per ml. The '745 application also claims that the lymphocytes can be transfected with a foreign gene using a retrovirus, adenovirus, or simian virus. Additionally, it would be obvious to further expand the cells with IL-2 and anti-CD3, since Mizobata et al. teach that IL-2 and anti-CD3 induce proliferation of cytotoxic lymphocytes (see Fig. 1 in particular). Additionally, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 1644

use PBMC as the source of the cytotoxic lymphocytes in the method claimed in the '745 application, since Mizobata et al. teach that cytotoxic lymphocytes can be derived from PBMC.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant's request that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections be held in abeyance until the time of allowance is acknowledged.

8. The following are new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment to the claims.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-7, 10, 12, 28-30, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al., 1990 and Cardarelli et al., 1991 (of record), in view of U.S. Patent 5,198,423 (of record), as evidenced by Janeway and a Travers, 1997.

Davis et al. teach a method comprising incubating PBMCs with anti-CD3, IL-2, and plate bound fibronectin for 4 days (see page 786-787 in particular). Davis et al. teach that the method results in the expansion of CD8 T cells (i.e. increases the number of CD8+ cells, see page 788 in particular). Davis et al. teach that the concentration of cells at the initiation of the culture is $0.5 - 1. \times 10^5$ cells/well in 0.2 mls (i.e. 2.5 to 5 x

Art Unit: 1644

10^5 cells/ml, see page 787 in particular). Additionally, as evidenced by Janeway and Travers, CD8+ T cells are cytotoxic T cells (see page 4:2, in particular). Thus, the method of Davis et al. results in the expansion of CD8+ cytotoxic lymphocytes. Furthermore, expanding the number of CD8+ cytotoxic lymphocytes would result in increase in cytotoxic activity (i.e. an improvement in cytotoxic activity). Additionally, Cardarelli et al. teach that culture of PBMCs with immobilized fibronectin results in increased IL-2 receptor expression (see Table 2 in particular).

Neither Davis et al. nor Cardarelli et al. teach a fibronectin fragment comprising SEQ ID NO: 12, or immobilizing the fibronectin on a petri dish, flask, or bag.

The '423 patent teaches a biologically active recombinant fibronectin fragment comprising SEQ ID NO: 12 (see columns 3-4 in particular). The '423 patent also teaches that the recombinant fibronectin is advantageous compared to natural fibronectin, which is limited in supply, costly to produce, and potentially contaminated with bacteria and viruses (see column 1 in particular).

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the recombinant fibronectin fragment taught by the '423 patent, for the purified human fibronectin in the method of Davis et al. or Cardarelli et al. The ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so, since the '423 patent teaches that the recombinant fibronectin is advantageous compared to natural fibronectin, which is limited in supply, costly to produce, and potentially contaminated with bacteria and viruses. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in substituting the recombinant fibronectin fragment, since the '423 patent teaches that the recombinant fibronectin is a biologically fragment. Additionally, it would have been obvious to culture the cells in a petri dish, a flask, or a bag, since these are all well known and routine vessels used for performing tissue culture.

11. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al., 1990 and Cardarelli et al., 1991, and U.S. Patent 5,198,423, as applied to claims 1-7, 10,

Art Unit: 1644

12, 28-30, and 33-35 above, and further in view of Chen et al., 1994 (of record).

The combined teachings of Davis et al., Cardarelli et al., and the '423 patent are described above.

They do not teach transducing a foreign gene into the T cells.

Chen et al. teach that retroviral transduction of T cells with PKC allows long term growth of the cells in vitro with maintenance of function and specificity, thus providing a useful approach for more easily procuring large numbers of said cells (see pages 3634-3635, in particular).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further transduce the T lymphocytes made by the method of Davis et al., 1990, Cardarelli et al., 1991, and the '423 patent, with a retrovirus encoding PKC, as taught by Chen et al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so, and have a reasonable expectation of success, since Chen et al. teach that retroviral transduction of T cells with PKC allows long term growth of the cells in vitro with maintenance of function and specificity, thus providing a useful approach for more easily procuring large numbers of said cells.

12. No claim is allowed.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1644

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy E. Juedes, whose telephone number is 571-272-4471. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am to 3:30pm, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen O'Hara can be reached on 571-272-0878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amy E. Juedes
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

/G.R. Ewoldt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644